

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the non-final Office Action dated September 21, 2005.

Claims 1-18 are pending. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-8 are cancelled and claims 9-18 are new and contain no new matter. New Claim 9 is based on claim 4 as originally filed together with the description appearing between pages 12 and 14 of the specification. Support for new claim 10 may be found on page 14 lines 31-36, and at, for example, page 7 lines 29 and 30. A basis for new claim 12 may be found on page 14 lines 6-13 and in Figure 3. A basis for new claim 13 may be found at, for example, page 10 line 19 – page 11 line 16. Support for new claim 14 may be found on page 11 lines 11-16. Support for new claim 15 may be found on page 15 lines 9-21. A basis for new claim 16 may be found on page 10 lines 19-31. Support for new claim 17 may be found on page 11 line 29 – page 12 line 5. A basis for new claim 18 may be found on page 14 lines 33-36.

In the September 21, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner requested new drawings based on the assertion that the previously submitted drawings are incomprehensible. Further, an Abstract of the disclosure was requested. Claims 4 and 6-8 were objected to as being in improper multiply dependent form. Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as being indefinite. Lastly, Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,910 to Ulwick in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,943 to Minder.

I. Drawings & Abstract of the Disclosure

Applicant has enclosed corrected drawings and an abstract of the disclosure herewith. Applicant respectfully submits that the defects identified by the Examiner in these respects are cured.

II. Objections Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) & Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments to the claims have addressed the Examiner's objections based on improper multiply dependent form and the asserted failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8 have been cancelled and new claims 9-18 added to emphasize the technical nature of the claimed invention and to further clarify the scope and subject matter of the claimed invention.

In accordance with new claim 9, apparatus for aiding the decision making process of a user selecting from a plurality of products/services is provided which includes a user interface comprising a first and second portion. The first portion of the user interface displays indications of user input selection criteria and the second displays a selection derived from that criteria. The advantage of such a system is that by virtue of such a display a user does not have to remember the input values used to define their selections as the input values are displayed simultaneously with the results of that selection.

Additionally as required by claim 9 the displayed filtered selection which is a result of the input user value themselves comprise selectable graphical icons wherein selecting the individual displayed icon enables a user to view additional information.

In this respect, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to a current exemplary implementation of the claimed invention which is accessible on the Internet at: <http://www.iokio.com/demos/camerafinder/>. When the a user accesses the site, the user is presented with a user interface in which a selection of camera images are displayed simultaneously with a series of sliders where adjusting the position of the sliders will adjust the number of cameras displayed in the left-hand portion of the screen. In addition to the simultaneous presentation of user input selection criteria and a filtered set of results, each of the graphic representations of the cameras on the left-hand portion of the screen are selectable, and selecting the camera causes further information on this specific product/service to be displayed to a user. None of the prior art of record discloses or suggests the advantageous combination of the simultaneous display of user input criteria and the filtered results determined by processing those criteria, where the filtered results comprise selectable icons and where selecting the icons enables a user to obtain further information about a specific product/service.

The dependent claims are directed to further aspects of the claimed invention. With respect to claims 14 and 15, the examiner is invited to access the “wine selector” at <http://www.winehub.co.uk/acatalog/easelect/selectawine/whiteframes.html>, a further example of a decision aid system implemented in accordance with the claimed invention.

A problem noted in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 concerns what is described as “pogo sticking” where user interfaces requires a user to jump up and down between a sequence of web pages. For example, in the case of the camera selection website, in

order to access information on cameras for filling input criteria, a user must individually select each camera to obtain further information on the cameras before returning to the main selection screen. In addition to displaying the filtered results, which are filtered on the basis of input user selection criteria, where a user interface such as the wine hub interface orders the selection on the basis of a match in the manner suggested in the application, two further advantages are apparent. First by ordering the results, the user is guided by the user interface as to the order in which product/services should be reviewed. Furthermore, as noted in the specification on pages 15, ranking products/processes enables a limited number of the best “best” matches to be displayed to a user at any one time. As stated on page 5 of the Specification, this eases the task of comparing the products and increases the user satisfaction since a user is still directly involved in the decision making process.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of claims 9-18 is respectfully requested. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in a effort to advance prosecution of this application..

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587
(212) 408-2588

Robert L. Maier
PTO Reg. No. 54,291
(212) 408-2538

Attorneys for Applicants

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112